Dear colleagues and friends,

This new issue of our Newsletter offers us a new opportunity to enter in contact with all of you, our friends and colleagues, interested in the history of applied psychology, and to invite you to collaborate with us in this common project, bringing us news, articles and suggestions that would enrich these pages.

This issue wants to echo some recent events affecting directly to our community. First of all, Dr. Hugo Klappenbach, a colleague always close to our projects and goals, has been elected President-elect of the Interamerican Psychological Society (SIP), the largest international psychological association that gathers professionals and academicians from all the American psychology groups, lines and traditions, and a true instrument of communication and interaction for all those that participate in its periodical conventions.

Dr. Klappenbach is one of the leading figures in the field of the history of psychology in the Latin American world. He is carrying out an excellent work in promoting and enhancing the study and research in our field, from his chair at the National University of San Luis (Argentina), but at the same time, he has proved to be a person deeply interested in the basic question of the training of professionals, a problem that deeply affects to the psychological field, highly sensible to those changes and movements that are continuously enriching both the theoretical body and the
collection of instruments that are at hand of psychologists.

He knows firsthand the present situation of professionals in most of LA countries, and, at the same time, has a detailed information on the recent history of the field. His presence in the Board of Directors of the SIP will undoubtedly serve to enhance the interest for a broad consideration of the whole interaction network that mediates between theory and practice in psychology. I thank very much Dr. Klappenbach for his friendliness and availability for answering our questions, that surely will interest to all of you. Latin American psychology is growing and moving ahead very rapidly, and our interview will widen our knowledge of its prospects and problems.

Another focus of our interest is the recent apparition of the new edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, DSM-V, one of the basic instruments employed in clinical psychology and psychiatry by specialists and professionals, as a system of classification of disorders that enable them to produce scientifically based diagnoses. Twenty years have passed since the publication of DSM IV. During this time, important advances have taken place in the etiological and symptomatic study of mental disorders and pathologies: Neurosciences have given gigantic steps ahead in such a knowledge; positive psychology has also enriched our views of human behavior; genomic medicine and pharmacological research have also got important new views of mental mechanisms. Time was ripe for a new orderly system of concepts through which a deeper understanding would be obtained. Professionals now have the floor for discussions and conclusions, that will bring us new advances and more proficient interventions.

And, last but not least, a short article on H. Zulliger, by Dr. Andrea Castiello D’Antonio, will offer some insights on a personality of Zulliger that did significant work in the area of projective testing, and added useful elements for the Rorschach projective test use. This is a case of cooperation from outside with the editors of the Newsletter, and we will now to repeat our invitation to our readers and followers to send us short pieces that will widen our knowledge with new factual information and insights.

And a very sad last minute news: Dr. Charles D. Spielberger, a past IAAP president, has passed away at his residence of Tampa (Florida, US). He has been a great psychologist, an indefatigable researcher, a tireless organizer, and a real master and friend for many of us. A very short obituary of him has been immediately included.

Very cordially,

Professor Helio Carpintero, Ph.D.
DSM-5 (formerly known as DSM-V) is the fifth edition of the American Psychiatric Association's (APA) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. In the United States, and in many other parts of the scientific world, the DSM serves as a universal authority for the diagnosis of psychiatric disorders. Treatment recommendations, as well as payment by health care providers, are often determined by DSM classifications, so the appearance of a new version has significant practical importance. According to professor Victoria del Barrio (2004), the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM) classification system for mental disorders, developed by the American Psychiatric Association and now employed worldwide, has its historical roots in the previous systems dating back over several centuries, from the Greek Hippocrates in the fourth-century BC to the nineteenth-century German Psychiatric Emil Kraepelin. The classification is both the process and the result of arranging individuals into groups formed on the basis of common characteristics. In USA, the social and professional need to collect statistical information on mental disorders lead into the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DS) published by American Psychiatric Association. In 1880 the census distinguished among seven categories: mania, melancholia, monomania, paresis, dementia, dipsomania, and epilepsy. In 1917, a "Committee on Statistics" from what is now known as the American Psychiatric Association (APA), together with the National Commission on Mental Hygiene, developed a new guide for mental hospitals called the "Statistical Manual for the Use of Institutions for the Insane", which included 22 diagnoses. This was subsequently revised several times by APA over the years. APA, along with the New York Academy of Medicine, also provided the psychiatric nomenclature subsection of the US medical guide, the "Standard Classified Nomenclature of Disease", referred to as the "Standard". A brief chronological edition of DSM in USA can be summed up as follows:

**DSM-I (1952):** World War II created a significant large-scale involvement of US psychiatrists in the selection, processing, assessment and treatment of soldiers. This moved the focus away from mental institutions and traditional clinical perspectives. A committee headed by psychiatrist and brigadier general William C. Menninger developed a new classification scheme called Medical 203, issued in 1943 as a "War Department Technical Bulletin" under the auspices of the Office of the Surgeon General. The manual was 130 pages long and listed 106 mental disorders. “It took into account not only biological but also social and psychological elements and it offered a multidimensional consideration of disorders” (Del Barrio, 2004, p. 608).

(*) Richard Mababu is professor of Psychology at Universidad a Distancia de Madrid (UDIMA), Spain.
DSM-II (1968): In 1968, APA decided to revise the DSM-I and in this new version listed 182 disorders in a work 134 pages long. In general, DSM-II was similar to DSM-I. May be one of the significant changes was that the term “reaction” was dropped out while the one of “neurosis” was retained. Both DSM-I and DSM-II reflected the predominant psychodynamic theory although they also included biological perspectives and concepts from the Kraepelin’s classification system. Following controversy and protests from gay activists at APA annual conferences from 1970 to 1973, as well as the emergence of new data from researchers such as Alfred Kinsey and Evelyn Hooker, the seventh printing of the DSM-II, in 1974, no longer listed ‘homosexuality’ as a category of disorder. But through the efforts of psychiatrist Robert Spitzer, who had led the DSM-II development committee, a vote by the APA trustees in 1973, and confirmed by the wider APA membership in 1974, such diagnosis term was substituted by the one of “sexual orientation disturbance”.

DSM-III (1980) and DSM-III-R (1987): During the revision of 1974, a great effort was centered in making consistent the DSM nomenclature with the one of the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD), published by the World Health Organization (WHO). Robert Spitzer leaded this new revision of the DSM with the goal of improving the uniformity and validity of psychiatric diagnosis in the wake of a number of critiques. In 1980, the DSM-III listed 265 diagnostic categories (in 494 pages long). It rapidly came into widespread international use by multiple stakeholders and has been termed a revolution or transformation in psychiatry. In 1987 Spitzer and his team made a new revision of DSM-III, renaming and reorganizing its categories. Altogether, DSM-III-R contained 292 diagnoses reorganized in document of 567 pages long.

DSM-IV (1994) and DSM-IV-TR (2000): In 1994, a committee of experts and scientific groups from all over the world, leaded by Allen Frances, prepared the revision of DSM-III-R. The features of this new version included (i) brevity of criteria set, (ii) clarity of language, (iii) explicit statement of its constructs, (iv) it was based on up-to-date empirical data, and (v) a better coordination with ICD-10 (International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision). The DSM IV attracted criticism from various theoretical points of view; among them, it stands out the antipsychiatric movement, that has always been against the use of classifications in psychiatry, as it considers labeling a dangerous procedure. DSM-IV lists 297 disorders in 886 pages. In the year 2000, the diagnostic categories were updated, mainly in the diagnostic codes section, in order to maintain its consistency with the ICD.

DSM-V (2013): The DSM-5 (or formally DSM-V) has just been published on May 18th, 2013, superseding the DSM-IV, which was published in 1994 and revised in 2000. The development of the new edition began with a conference in 1999, and proceeded with the formation of a Task Force in 2007, which developed and field-tested a variety of new classifications. The DSM-5 contains extensively revised diagnoses and, in some cases, broadens diagnostic definitions while narrowing others. In most respects DSM-5 has not greatly changed from DSM-IV. Notable innovations include dropping Asperger syndrome as a distinct classification; loss of subtype classifications for variant forms of schizophrenia; dropping the "bereavement exclusion" for depressive disorders; a revised treatment of gender identity issues; and the introduction of a new 'gambling disorder'.

(DSM-5) has raised an expected criticism since its release. Criticism coming from many psychologists and psychiatrists (led by Patrick Landman, a prominent French psychiatrist) has focused on the following issues: (a) It’s impossible to classify mental disorders; (b) DSM is just a money maker; (c)
Under DSM-5, more people will be diagnosed with a mental disorder; (d) The DSM is trying to redefine what is and is not normal. Critics have also argued that its new thresholds will lead to an increase in claims for work-related disability or compensation, allowing more people to take extended sick leave. Some changes that may have significant effects on the working population are to be found in depression and anxiety disorders, including post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

In any case, the apparition of its new version will, no doubt, have a great impact upon the whole field of clinical psychology, and on the more general views on assessing procedures and techniques. The need for a classification system, the determination of those symptoms and characteristic traits of the various pathologies, and the existence of an instrument with so great acceptance all over the world allows to our professionals an objective approach, a rigorous exchange of knowledge, and the making of a differential diagnosis in most cases; in a few words, it allows the existence of our science with the status of rigor and the properties of generality and intersubjectivity; without it, scientific thought cannot be acknowledged as such. No scientific work is made ‘for ever’. But we welcome the appearance of this new edition of such important instrument in the hands of clinical psychologists wherever they will be working.
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Hans Zulliger was born in Biel on February 21st, 1893, and spent his entire life in a small village called Ittigen (Switzerland). From 1912 until 1959 he dedicated himself to teaching. Zulliger came into contact with the impressive work developed by Oskar Pfister (1873-1956) on the psychoanalytic method. He soon became a passionate student of Freudian psychoanalysis, without neglecting the views proposed by Alfred Adler and Carl Gustav Jung. His first publications allowed him to get in touch with Sigmund Freud. Shortly after, he was invited to become a member of the Swiss Society of Psychoanalysis: here he met, among others, Hermann Rorschach (1884-1922).

Hans Zulliger was a polyhedral practitioner: teacher, psychologist, psychoanalyst, psycho-diagnostician, researcher and scholar in the field of psychological testing, developer of an important projective technique (the so-called Z-Test) and disseminator of Rorschach Test and Be-Ro Test.

It's important to note that Zulliger had the opportunity to live and work for decades in a small, permanent community: he followed the development of many young people, testing a great number of subjects in different moments of their lives, and counseling with them. First disciple and then friend of Rorschach, Zulliger was probably the only one, within the inner circle of scholars that revolved around Rorschach, and lived so long to continue, in the course of his own life, taking care of Rorschach’s work. He gradually emerged as a champion of the parallel test form known as Behn-Rorschach, named after the student and colleague of Rorschach, Hans Behn-Eschenburg (1893-1934). However his name is linked to the “Z-Test”, or “Zulliger Projective Technique”, created for the selection of Swiss Army officers during World War II.

The Z-Test is a projective test consisting of three laminas similar to those of Rorschach’s, used to establish an accurate psychological diagnosis in a limited time. The Z-Test is administered in individual setting or in group setting, in different professional contexts from organizational, clinical, forensic and educational fields.

For more information on Zulliger Projective Test, visit http://www.zulligeronline.com

(*) Dr. Andrea Castiello D’Antonio is Professor at European University of Rome, Dept. of Psychology, Rome, Italy.

Further Readings.
Castiello d’Antonio A., Carruba P. (2008), Zulliger Test. La Tecnica Proiettiva di Hans Zulliger nella
An interview with Dr. Hugo Klappenbach (*)

(Interviewed by Prof. Helio Carpintero)

Dr. Hugo Klappenbach, currently full professor of history of psychology at the National University of San Luis (Argentina), has just been elected as President-elect for the Interamerican Psychological Society (SIP), probably the most important international psychological society gathering professionals and academicians from the LatinAmerican (LA) and NorthAmerican countries. He has been very kind in accepting to have with this Newsletter an interview, on several interesting points of the psychological panorama.

Question (Q.): How do you see the current situation of psychology in LA?

Answer (A.): LA psychology, since its origins, has always had a very strong applied and practical orientation. Our social contexts were asking to psychology the solving of a variety of problems and demands, at the beginning related to the fields of law, work and education, and later to the one of health.

When considering the main achievements of LA psychology, it appears that it has been a great development in social and community psychology, in many countries, as for instance Puerto Rico Venezuela or Brazil, and also important advances in clinical psychology, in Mexico or Argentina. There have appeared in these fields some original contributions; we could mention, among others, the cases of the psychology of liberation by Ignacio Martin-Baró, some idiosyncratic developments of the experimental analysis of behavior, or some works on political psychology. It is true that, for instance, political psychology has not been originated in LA countries, but, as Maritza Montero has shown, the enhancement of communitarian structures took place among us in parallel with the raising of the question of ‘empowerment’ in the United States. Similarly, as Jose Miguel Salazar indicated time ago, there has been in LA a certain tradition of critical marxist psychology, surged up in Cuba and in some other countries, that includes developments that cannot be found in the Soviet marxist psychology.

A limitation of LA psychology is that it is scarcely known out of its region. Although a great effort has been made with the creation of regional data bases, like Scielo, Dialnet, Redalyc, Bireme or Psicodoc, there are still only few LA original papers included in PsycInfo.

In my opinion, the movement in favour of a polycentric history as the one proposed by Danziger or Brock will in the end contribute to overcome such limitation. And a similar effect may have the movement for the internationalization of psychology. But this is a slow process, due to the idiomatic difficulties. And it must be mentioned as a positive fact that recent issues of the International Psychology Bulletin have included some notes on “Psychology in LA: Legacies and Contributions”, with information about those Spanish or Portuguese speaking psychologists that received the SIP award in past years.

(*) Dr. Hugo Klappenbach, currently full professor of history of psychology at the National University of San Luis (Argentina), is also Research Professor at the CONICET (Argentina), and has published many papers on history and professional training in psychology. He has just been elected as President-elect for the Interamerican Psychological Society (SIP).
Q.: Dr. Klappenbach is a prominent personality in the international scene of the history of psychology. Which is, in your opinion, the relevance accorded by psychologists to the history of psychology field?

A.: First of all, many thanks for your appreciation of my person. In fact, it is possible to work out in this field only when there is a real interest in making research, be it in a direction away of psychology, or not. Moreover, such a movement has been very effective in placing the history of psychology inside the framework of plain historical research.

But it is possible also to discover another line that allows to ground and to discuss the basic content of the psychological field. For instance, history of psychology, general psychology and social psychology are the three only topics that offer to our students a general view of the psychological field. And as far as the applied psychology is involved, the historical approach is still far more interesting, as the various areas of intervention are the direct consequence of some complex historical processes.

Let us see, for instance, the evolution of clinical psychology, and the great significance that the Boulder model for training practitioners had in it. It cannot be made a sufficient analysis of such question without considering the after-war situation lived by the United States and the role that played there in those days the Veteran Association or the Institute for Mental Health. It is true that a reference to polycentric history as those made by Kurt Danziger or Adrian Brock are related to those various cultural contexts from which psychological discourses and practices emerged. But it would also be possible to build a polycentric history taking into account the different applied areas. It is clear that the history of educational psychology greatly differs from the development of sport or gender psychology...

Q.: Is the history of psychology worth for scientists? And is the history of applied psychology of any value for the creation of an identity among psychology professionals in developed countries? And, is still of application the question of the existence or inexistence of a paradigm in psychology, or such question is now meaningless, and has been substituted by the search of models for the various concrete topics dealing with?

A.: I am not sure if I'll be able to answer such a complex question. The problem of the ‘unity versus variety’ in psychology is older than it was supposed to be. Some recent works compiled by Thomas Sturm and Annette Mülberger in Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences are showing that the first discussions on the crisis of psychology were not those made by Bühler or Kostyleff, but were other different papers written in the end of 19th century. The diversity of points of view in psychology is as old as it is our own field, and, at the same time, the efforts in favor of a conceptual unification are equally old.

Q.: How do you see the present and the future connections between psychology and neurosciences? And how do you see the rapid growth that is experiencing the ‘positive psychology’ movement?

A.: It seems to me that such relation will be central in the coming future. I remember now that in many interviews included by Ruben Ardila in his book on The future of psychology, such trend was clearly underlined. But, when the contributions of cultural psychology, such as the ones by Michael Cole, are also considered, it also appears the need to strengthen the connections with social sciences and with anthropology. In my opinion, the psychological explanations will demand both biological and neurochemical data as well as anthropological and sociological considerations. Human behavior must be viewed as the behavior of an organism in a certain social context; and I still consider psychology as a field in-between natural and social sciences, or, in other words, both a natural and social science. And due to such a double sided condition, so many difficulties and complexities arise in psychological theorizing.
As for the case of positive psychology, it may be seen as a typical American topic. Seligman's interest in a psychology focusing on the positive aspects of behavior, instead of the pathological ones, clearly reveals the great weight of clinical psychology upon the profession in the US., a fact that is characteristic of the American psychology, although, it is true, it can also be found in many other places. But it must be reminded that some studies on resilience and 'salutogenic' factors, as those carried out by Martina Casullo in my country, Argentina, clearly prove that the interest for those traits with positive influence upon human potentialities is not a newcomer in today's research.

Other studies on community- and political psychology, carried out in LA, did also find that some factors favouring empowerment are far from the upper mentioned orientation towards pathological topics. I will not say that research on community empowerment is the same as positive psychology, at least in Seligman's view. But both types of problems have deep similarities after all. And such affinities will perhaps reinforce the communitarian research in social psychology, although not necessarily in accordance with Seligman's viewpoints.

Q. Which are your main objectives for your SIP presidency?

A.: First of all, as you probably know, I will incorporate myself to the SIP Board of Directors next July, as President-elect, to work together with an acting President and a Past President. On such situation, my first goal is to contribute to reach the now existing Board approved goals. I would like to do my best in consolidating some recent achievements, as the incorporation of student representatives to the Board. The evolution experienced by the Latin American Society of Psychology Students, (SOLEPsi) is well in favor of a larger participation within the SIP works.

Secondly, I think that SIP is prepared to promote the holding of a Second LA Conference on Training and Formation in Psychology. The first one took place in 1974, and since then, many significant changes have taken place in psychology in our countries, and also in the proper training-of-psychologist topic.

Last but not least, I hope we will be able to reinforce the body of national representatives, in order to get a stronger voice that will give new strength to our associations, societies, and unions, in their claims and projects in the international arena.

Q.: How do you see the roles that should play those international scientific societies, such as IUPsyS and IAAP, in psychology?

A.: The process of internationalization of science is very well known. Since the very old letters exchanged among pioneer scientists, time ago, it is clear that scientific knowledge looks for being an international reality. I have somewhere said that globalization is a phenomenon born with the modern time, (while perhaps someone would prefer to say that it was born in the Hellenic epoch). Kant appealed to the world citizens in the same manner as Marx did with the proletarian people. We now usually focus only on the bad effects of economy globalization, and we forget that this same globalization was a trait included in the modernity project for a more democratic and fair society. It must be acknowledged that globalization does not oppose neither to national nor regional or local development. Both global and national aspects are complementary sides of the same being. In this direction, our international psychological societies have an important role, as they provide us with a multicultural and transcultural exchange of ideas and of professionals. Congresses held by IUPsyS, by IAAP or by SIP allow us to overcome our limits and to get new models and experiences that enrich our own thought.

As far as I know, there is a common timetable established by those societies, (also including, for instance, the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology) and I think that such coordination is a very important goal to achieve and enhance.
Q.: What is your message for psychology professionals currently working in our world?

A.: I think that I am not the right person to make a broad prospective of what may happen in the future in different parts of the world. But I think we should be able to draw conclusions and learn lessons about the financial crisis that has unfolded even on strongly developed societies like the American or European. First of all, it seems to me that, more as citizens than psychologists, we must create democratic and sustainable strategies to prevent our world from falling into the hands of economic and financial powers, only interested in self profit.

I think that most citizens, beyond the legitimate differences among existing political views, are more interested in many more issues than the sole economic gain; people are interested in issues like the rational care of the planet's reserves, education, culture, equality of opportunities and justice, tolerance and peace among nations. So, we must strengthen an international citizenship, a concept from community psychology which enables us to direct economic and financial processes in the sense of a rational, humanitarian and fair direction.

In that context, I think psychology professionals have a specific key role in promoting understanding among people, either in social and community psychology, also in the fields of work, education, health, or domestic violence, and even in those processes aiming at peace and at solving conflicts between stakeholders with different positions and thoughts.

Psychology is the science of behavior and human subjectivity and everything related to behavior and subjectivity involves the interest of psychology. More and more, and in most varied fields, the professional psychologist is required for an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary work, according to the complexity and multi-causality of human behavior.

In fact, I doubt if I am able to send a general message for those professionals of psychology, but I would dare to say that in their role there are involved two complementary directions: one is their commitment to promoting rigorous scientific knowledge in the field, and the other is to attend to the social relevance of all psychological intervention.
Obituary - Charles D. Spielberger (1927-2013)

by Prof. Helio Carpintero

Just in the last minute, before sending this issue to the mail, we have had a sad news: our highly appreciated master and friend Charles D. Spielberger, an internationally known and respected figure, and a widely acknowledged researcher in the field of personality evaluation, has passed away at his home at Tampa, Fl. (US).

Dr. Spielberger, born in 1927, after receiving a scientific and technical training at the Georgia Institute of Technology (1949) and a Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of Iowa, became deeply involved in research in the area of personality evaluation. His wellknown tests on anger and anxiety measurement (among them, the State Trait Anger Scale, and the State Trait Anxiety Inventory, STAI) have been adapted and employed in many countries outside the US. His author was able to create an important network of collaborators and specialists all over the world, giving support to his views on assessment and clinical intervention, with a cross cultural data basis.

He had an enormous capacity for work. For many years he was director of the Center for Research in Behavioral Medicine and Health Psychology, at the University of South Florida (Tampa, Fl.). But at the same time, he was also deeply involved in many scientific and professional societies. Among other relevant positions, he was president of the American Psychological Association (1991-2) and of the International Council of Psychologists (ICP) (1986-87) as well as president of the International Association of Applied Psychology -our society- in the period 1998-2002. He was also founder of the Society for Test Anxiety Research (STAR), heading it from 1981 till 1984.

He was for years a tireless traveler, lecturing in universities and developing research programs on the themes of his specialty with local groups of colleagues. I had the opportunity to meet him and his very distinguished wife, Carol Lee, the dear companion for his travels and meetings around the world, with occasion of his many visits to Spain, where he found important collaborators such as R. Fernandez-Ballesteros, V. del Barrio, J. Miguel Tobal, A. Cano-Vindel, D. Gomez, G. Buela, A. Aluja, among others.

In recent years he made important contributions to health psychology, and behavioral medicine. Namely, he paid great attention to the influence of psychological variables upon cardiovascular disorders and cancer, and to the problem of job stress in modern life.

He wrote many articles and books on the cited topics; among them: Anxiety and Behavior (1966), Anxiety. Current trends in theory and research, (1972), Stress and anxiety (with I. Sarason) (1975), Cross cultural anxiety (with R. Diaz-Guerrero) (1976); and was the chief editor of the Encyclopedia of Applied Psychology, a three volume significant contribution to the knowledge of our thematic field (2004).

He usually attended most of the international congresses where clinical psychology and assessment in which he always made significant presentations and discussions. There he multiplied his contacts with older and younger people working on the topics he was interested in. From now on, he will be missed by countless friends and colleagues all over the world. His ideas, his instruments of work and his lessons on how to deal with psychological problems, will not be lost.
ICAP 2014, Paris from 8-13 of July in 2014: From crisis to sustainable well-being

IAAP is pleased to invite you to the 28th International Congress of Applied Psychology (ICAP) that will be held in Paris, from 8-13 of July in 2014. IAAP also encourages you to prepare and take steps to assure your participation in such an important international event of Psychology. This Congress is organized in collaboration with the "French Federation for Psychologists and Psychology" (FFPP) as well as "French Society of Psychology" (SFP), along with the "French National Committee of Scientific Psychology" (CNFPS), under the umbrella of the "French Consortium of Psychology Associations" (A-CIPA).

Prof. José M. Peiró, President of the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP), and Prof. Christine Roland-Lévy, President of the 28th ICAP and President of the French Consortium of Psychology Associations warmly invite you to join this International Congress of Applied Psychology, ICAP 2014, in Paris (from 8-13 of July in 2014).

For more information, www.icap2014.com

- Congresses, Seminars, ... & more

The 13th European Congress of Psychology.
July 9-12, 2013. Stockholm (SWEDEN)
www.ecp2013.org

XXXIV Interamerican Congress of Psychology (SIP).
www.sip2013.org

The ISSP 13th World Congress of Sport Psychology.
Julio 21 - 25, 2013. Beijing. CHINA.

7th World Congress in Behavioural and Cognitive Therapies, WCBCT.
July 22-25, 2013. Lima. PERÚ.
http://www.wcbct2013.pe/

121st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association
31 July – 4 August 2013, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA.
http://www.apa.org/convention

54th Annual Meeting of the Psychonomic Society.
November 14-17, 2013. Toronto, Ontario, CANÁDA.
www.psychonomic.org/annual-meeting.html
122nd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association
7-10 August 2014, Washington DC, USA.
http://www.apa.org/convention

Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD).
www.srcd.org

European Congress of Psychology.
July 7 - 10, 2015. Milan, ITALY.
www.ecp2015.eu

123rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association.
August 6 - 9, 2015. Washington DC, USA.
www.apa.org/convention

31st International Congress of Psychology.
July 24 - 29, 2016. Yokohama, JAPAN.
www.icp2016.jp

Links of Interest

Academic & National Library Catalogue
http://copac.ac.uk/

Division of History of Science and Technology of the Union of History & Philosophy of Science
https://sites.google.com/a/dhstweb.org/

World Digital Library
http://www.wdl.org/en/

Psychological Online Documents Classics - Universität Bonn

International Association of Applied Psychology
http://www.iaapsy.org/

APA History and Archives

The National Archives. Records of the UK government from Domesday to the present
http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/

Psychology Museum at the School of Psychology at The University of Sydney
http://www.psych.usyd.edu.au/museum

The British Society for the History of Science
www.bshs.org.uk

Membership

To become a member,
simply follow the instructions at IAAP official
Website http://www.iaapsy.org/

Invitation to collaborate to this Newsletter

If you wish to collaborate to this Newsletter you can send us your comment or topic reaching our co-editor:
Richard Mababu, Ph.D - e-mail: richard.mababu@udima.es